A U M

As the lesser mysteries are to be delivered before the greater, thus also discipline st precede philosophy. —IAMBLICUS.

THEOSOPHY

ol. XVIII February, 1930 No. 4

WHAT EVERY THEOSOPHIST CAN DO

WHAT can *I* do for Theosophy? Where there's a *will,* there's a way. The gaining of Self-reliance—the true Will—is the great need of all, and this can only be acired by Theosophical study and work.

Every Theosophist can consistently and persistently set apart a rtain period, however short, in each day for a brief reading of ndamental truths; for restatement to himself of those truths; for *elling upon* their latent presence in every man, upon the necessity r their awakening in himself and in all others. This will surely e faith, energy and increased perception—the essential prequisites to awakening the Intuition.

Every student can cultivate as a practice the habit of putting his art into his daily duties, from the most trivial and passing to the ost important—of doing well whatever he has to do, and all with e avowed object of self-discipline, in order to fit himself to be the tter able to serve others. This is Concentration.

Every student can thus familiarize himself with Theosophical ctrines and their application to all the affairs of daily life. This ll *naturally* draw those with whom he is in contact under the same luence, and he can then direct those who are enquiring to pure heosophical books and meetings. All cannot be teachers, but there no student, so living, who cannot help the Cause by correcting roneous impressions, by refusing his countenance to impure teachs and teachings, by defending the Message, the Messenger, and all e Theosophists against enemies without and traitors within. *heosophist is who Theosophy does.*

DEATH AND REBIRTH

DEATH, as a fact in Nature, remains what it always has been "so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary." The same with its analogue, birth. Together they constitute "our entrance and our exit." Beyond our common knowledge of these facts, who can say, "I know?"

In view of this, it is self-evident that the varying faiths, the many degrees of doubt and scepticism, the hopes and fears of men with respect to antecedent existence or *post mortem* survival, all rest upon our ignorance, not our knowledge. Strange bed-fellows: common knowledge and common ignorance on one and the same subject, human life, in the minds of those very Beings who are that Life itself!

Stranger still, if anything, that men should struggle to maintain what must necessarily be a state of unstable equilibrium; for who but recognizes that knowledge, and knowledge alone, provides that sure centre of gravity which nothing can disturb? Our religion and our science, either or both, have never done more than bring us to a lethargy, a moral and mental stupefaction or paralysis, in the presence of this mightiest of all facts. Men everywhere, of whatever intellectual or moral environment, by their faith and their agnosticism, alike confess their profound conviction that the problem is insoluble—that Knowledge can not be had on this most vital of all experiences of the human being. So we find the curious spectacle of men holding their faith in front of their eyes, lest they see that which shall upset their hopes; others, wise in the phenomena of matter, shut their eyes to all else, proud of their ignorance as they are proud of their learning. In either case, the factors they will admit into their calculations, their methods of employing those factors, do not yield Knowledge. To believe, or to disbelieve—are they not both a confession of failure, the failure of ignorance?

Comes then Theosophy into the world of thought with its claim of knowledge, and concerning which the almost overpowering tendency of those attracted by it to fall into the pit of belief or of unbelief is the first reaction. To the religious mind, pierced with doubts through the armor of faith, Theosophy offers a fresh and more impregnable refuge. To the reasoning minds, its logic is so satisfying that, set at rest, they are enabled to concentrate all their energies on the things of this world. The scientifically-minded, seeing that Theosophy invites experimental verification, busies him-

self with the phenomena of the metaphysical world, as before he busied himself with the phenomena of the physical. The sceptical and those who desire to preserve present possessions rather than acquire new ones, apply their respective tests to the various claims of Theosophy, and are re-confirmed in their own opinions because they do not get the claimed results. All end no wiser than before. They were all "strivers for perfection"— *i. e.,* for Knowledge of the Mysteries of Life, birth, death, rebirth—and all have been content to stop short of the goal. So soon as they achieve the satisfaction of their desires, they cease to struggle.

Who is prepared to recognize that the satisfaction of Desire, even the noblest and the highest, is not the be-all and the end-all of existence, of evolution, of birth, and life, and death, and rebirth? This is, in truth, the very first lesson which Theosophy sets us to learn, and until learned, Knowledge of the Mysteries is impossible to be acquired. Desire is the *cause* of death and rebirth, is the producer of the fact, not of its understanding. Desire brought us here; desire keeps us here; desire takes us hence; desire takes us to the numberless states after death, and anon returns us to earth-life —a vicious circle, *within* which lies all from which we wish to escape as well as all which we wish to retain or acquire. Desire is the Concentration of the Soul upon effects, and the man so concentrated can but pass from one effect to another, from one world of effects to another—barred absolutely from any other form of Concentration. Birth, to him, is the beginning, as death to him, is the end of Life; Law, or God, is to him the cause of all things, the preserver of all things, the destroyer of all things. He perceives effects as *within* himself—his experiences of good and evil. He perceives causes as *outside* himself, and since the cause of death and rebirth is within himself, he is unable to regain either the memory or the knowledge "which was his in former births."

In what former births did we have the Knowledge of our own immortality, the memory of our own past lives, whether on earth or in other spheres of Being? If the first lesson which Theosophy teaches is learned, the answer is at hand: we had this knowledge and this memory before we "fell under the dominance of Matter" —in other words, before we fell victim to the effects experienced in earth-life. It is this form of Concentration which has to be broken, if Knowledge of the enduring Soul is to be gained. The dominance of Desire was long, very long, in becoming complete, and is not easily to be dissolved, for it is the Lord of heaven and of hell as

well as of earthly existence. Desire is the cause of mental and psychical as well as physical states.

Plunged in this concentration, absorbed in this meditation, it is impossible for us to have either memory or imagination beyond the circle of desire. That horizon expands or contracts according to the intensity of our concentration, but desire remains its centre, its self-reproductive germ. This is "meditation with a seed," and is what must have been meant by the ancient sages of Vedic days when they sang, "Desire first arose in That which was the primal germ of Mind." If they were able to chant this from *Knowledge,* then they must themselves have dwelt outside the magic circle of desire—the "circle Pass-Not" of human consciousness.

"But," it may be asked, "what *is* there beyond desire and its fruition, or effect?"

Self is beyond desire; the Powers of Self are beyond desire; the Knowledge of Self is beyond desire—as the Whole is beyond the part, as the Cause is beyond the effect, as the Knower is beyond the known, whether that Knower dwells in Wisdom, or in ignorance, or in misconception. What is the Divine kingdom? Self at rest in Knowledge. And the human kingdom? Self absorbed in its misconceptions. And the "lower kingdoms?" Self absorbed in its powers.

Theosophy teaches us that it is Self which is the real, the abiding; Self which is the creator and the creature; Self which is the "origin and the dissolution of all existing things;" that from Self "come memory, knowledge, and also *the loss of both.*" If these statements be in fact true, then it is self-evident we are among those who have lost both the memory and the knowledge of Self, and so can but wonder and speculate and imagine about our past and our future, about whence we came and what we are, and about "what will become of us" when this, our body, is destroyed: "When this our concentration in matter is destroyed," we would better say. Why, into some other form of concentration bred by our desire—if we do not learn better.

In Theosophy it is taught that Desire is one of the fundamental principles, or elements, or constituents of the human being. It is not so taught in any of the religions or halls of learning frequented by men in search of knowledge of the mysteries. Until the nature of desire is mastered, that is, understood, the mysteries of "our birth and our beginning," our aim and destiny, must necessarily remain sealed with the Seven Seals to us all.

Desire is but *one* of seven basic principles, each of which, in turn, may be the centre, or fulcrum, of "meditation and action," in the

human being. Whichever one is the seed, the others are not thereby annihilated; they merely become relative to the one which, for the time being, is absolute, because it *is* the fulcrum, the immovable part of the man's nature, around which all the rest revolve. But that motion is, of necessity, *eccentric,* until we find that center, or principle, from which all the others are but variations or departures. Eccentric motion is *Unbalanced* motion, and hence of necessity must wear itself out. Thrown off one false center of motion, we are immediately caught in the vortex of another, and so it must ever be until the Self within them all is admitted to be the One Reality in all forms of motion.

Is it not self-evident that the highest principle of Karma or conduct is deliberate, determined, self-chosen consideration for others as for one's Self, because of the perception or hypothesis that the Self is the enduring reality in all? This is the "cognition of the Self" that is practically expressed in the phrase "Universal Brotherhood." It is, affirmed Mr. Judge, "through the study of the *meaning* of Universal Brotherhood that the Truth in all things may be ascertained"—even of death and rebirth.

Those are the "true Theosophists" who, with all the calm ardor of the true scientist, set themselves to work to verify "by observation and experience" the experimental hypotheses of the Secret Doctrine.

Evidences

Every sincere student rises at times to perceptions possible only when thought, will and feeling are in line with his highest. However rare such moments are, they are *evidence* to the one experiencing them: evidence of the verity of the teachings, evidence of his own power to learn. And what an encouragement! Even a single such experience proves that others may be had; proves the possibility of attaining the terrace of enlightenment—just as a single self-induced step proves that walking is possible. Children in time learn even to *run!*

LOCKED DOORS

TO KNOW what the Teaching *is,* is one thing. To know what it *means,* is quite another. After years of persistent work, any good, solid, hard-working student of average capacity should be able at any and all times to give definitely what the Teacher *says* on most points of the philosophy. Each student must work out meanings, illustrations, applications for himself, though help may be given by his fellows. Thus knowledge develops. Knowledge is quite a different thing from the possession of information, however accurate; it is the grasp, use and understanding of information—"putting things together." So long as any student is satisfied with his abilities to repeat the texts, just so long will his own innate knowledge refrain from "springing up spontaneously within himself." But to know anything, he has to have that thing in his mind, meditate upon, and *do* something with it. Fructification inevitably follows—just as planting a seed and providing right conditions result in plant growth.

An expressed desire for "more advanced study" reveals almost invariably one who has failed to grasp the deep and subtle values of the "elementary work." Within the latter *is* the former. What appears superficially as more advanced study is in fact a consideration of *relations*—interesting, valuable, necessary, but always secondary. It represents the "scientific method," dealing with particulars. The true study brings one ultimately to an apprehension of universal truths, and some realization of the Unity of all Life. Thereupon relativities naturally fall into their proper places, because the Perceiver's vision is pure and simple. This is one of the reasons why what some call "advanced study" is better carried on individually than in classes; each individual has his own point of view, each Soul its own language. Each therefore has to do his own interpreting; each has to see and know for himself.

Locked doors permit neither ingress nor egress. The bound Soul has its own key—*is* its own key. 'Tis said this has to be turned seven times, and the texts indicate that four of the closed doors are in the personality that is the present hall-way to the Sanctuary. The four are really but one door, the master-lock of which is Mind, centred in some department of the lower nature. Turn this master-lock and the other three turns follow so naturally and easily that opening the door thereafter is but a matter of course and procedure. Where *is* the "Knot of the Heart?" It is *wherever* it is—in each one. That

Knot is where the Mind is centred—and the real study is of self, to determine and locate its knot, or locked door. All other study, every bit of it, is subsidiary to this; but all other is necessary to it. Nobody can locate doors unless he knows where to look for them, and how to identify them when discovered.

The Seed and the Soil

The Seed of Spiritual Knowledge is implanted in every human heart, but in mankind as a whole, it lies dormant—asleep. With the great majority, life consists in "keeping soul and body together." The feeding, clothing and housing of the physical body absorb all active energy. The difficulty of getting into this earthly existence, the still greater difficulty of maintaining our existence here, and the fear of death, owing to our ignorance of what lies beyond, these make up the sum of that misery called living, with more than three-fourths of the human race. With the small minority who are born to wealth and position, life consists in slavery to the conventionalities imposed by the station in which they are born, or to their own appetites and passions. Greedy for every cup of pleasure, they ring the changes on appetite till satiety and disgust lead to despair and death. In the rocky soil of all-absorbing self-interest, the divine Seed cannot come to birth; in the weed-ridden soil of refined selfishness, it cannot grow. The middle-class provide the suitable soil. Bound neither by extreme poverty on the one hand nor by conventionalities or the commands of wealth and position on the other, they have the opportunity to follow the bent of their nature and explore new fields. It is a class of freemen. To this growing middle-class belong individuals of every walk in life who realize that it is not all of life to live; who are not devoted solely either to the maintenance or the squandering of life; who are engaged in the true service of their fellow-men without distinctions of social or individual differences. In the fertile soil of unselfishness—of *practical altruism,* of charity in thought and word and deed—when duly and properly cultured, the divine Seed *will* germinate and bring forth after Its kind, and "bear fruit an hundredfold."

IMMUNOLOGY

ANY process or treatment having to do with the body is necessarily something more than physical; we cannot do thus and so to a certain set of cells and have the effect stop at the tip of our scalpel, any more than we can amputate a man's arm and leave his mental outlook, his financial, family, and religious relationships unaffected.

For over a hundred years the science of immunology has conducted itself upon the basis of certain crude, rough-hewn effects invariably following from equally crude, rough-hewn actions. Basically, disease is thought to be an invasion of the body lives by various categories of lives inimical. Inflict upon the body a mild invasion, and defensive forces are set up which will check a violent incursion. It is as though the well-wishers of a peaceful but unarmed nation were to make upon it a feigned attack, killing a few, destroying property, but withdrawing so soon as the nation attacked had rushed to arms and constructed a permanent standing army sufficient for any emergency. The result desired is gained; but what of the aftermath—of a nation into whose mind fear has been injected, which has turned a great part of its productive activities to arming against attack, whose entire hierarchical ruling system has been in some manner modified to carry on the new regime? The desired result is gained, yes; but how many other results, good, bad, or indifferent, may accrue unseen? Suppose that the economic waste of a standing army upsets the delicate balance of the internal system, and a progressive degeneration and sinking toward poverty insensibly sets in? Suppose that certain units, cast out of their peaceful orbits, imbued with "war psychology"—the "right of might"—form combinations for prey, and little by little, through force of example, through necessities brought on by their destructive activities, infect the whole body politic? What would our friendly invaders then say? Well, there are many, many putative causes for any political or economic ill other than the real ones; and it is to be suspected that our mistaken benefactors would find a sufficiency without admitting their mistake—unless to themselves!

The nature of scientific progress is such that the hidden holes and corners of nescience must sooner or later be searched out; biology could not be content with the mere injection of serums and the scratching of vaccines, but must needs look for causes; and no man

knoweth whither the search for causes may lead. Causes must especially be looked for when results turn out to be undependable.

The recent researches and conclusions of Dr. W. D. Mainwaring of Stanford University mark, perhaps, a turning point. And he is no despised osteopath, chiropractic, or nature-healer!

Writing in the *Scientific Monthly* for October, 1927, he went so far as to drastically criticise the Ehrlich theory, which has ruled immunology, and according to which any specific chemical substance which can be caused to appear or increase in blood serum as the result of an infection or immunization, is necessarily a defense against that special type of infection. Doctor Mainwaring states that though the theory has been endorsed by the medical profession for several decades, his own results go directly against it. Some of the products, he says, might have a specific protective action. *Others might increase susceptibility.* Some might be inert. *"Still others might cause non-specific variation in bodily resistance."* (Italics ours). What kind of variation—positive or negative? Variation to what disease or diseases?

In *Science* for June 21, 1929, Doctor Mainwaring pushed further along his daring road, stating that his experiments show that an injected serum, so far from behaving like an inorganic chemical substance of specific qualities, agreeably to the prevailing medical theories, actually feeds on the blood of its host as though it were a living thing. Tests of horse blood serum injected into rabbits, he said, showed an increase of 200 to 400 per cent. in volume. It was odd, he remarked, "that blood serum should be exercising one of the prerogatives of life." What prerogatives besides parasitism and multiplication, may it exercise? Serums and vaccines as normally used are animal proteins; animal cells are known to grow many times faster than human; is not that characteristic necessarily shared by these other animal substances now found to be alive? *Cancer is an anarchic and over-rapid cell growth; cancer cells are known to produce a serum or fluid which stimulates like growth.* What then must be the effect on human cells of living animal fluids injected? Is Sir William Arbuthnot Lane, the noted British physician, along with others, correct in saying that serums cause half the cancer?

Dr. T. Swann Harding[1] says that "No proteins can pass directly into the blood stream as such; if they did so the consequences would be disastrous." In fact, this is a lesson learned already by the bitter experience of the medical faculty. Is it to be supposed, then, that

---

[1]*Scientific Monthly,* November, 1927.

proteins can be forced into *any* tissues without undesirable and ulterior effects? Are the causes of *any* disorder, the causes of varying resistance thereto, well enough known for anyone to dogmatize in the negative, or to risk the integrity of his life-fluids upon a hypothesis? Different persons react differently to various proteins,[2] some even turning purple from eating eggs, beans, or milk. Protein poisoning creates a species of chemical bruise, causing blood to leak from the vessels. If there is this sensitiveness to proteins *naturally* ingested, what about those forced in with indefinite rupture and infiltration of tissues? What about individual sensitivities which there are no means of ascertaining in advance of injection? Sensitivities whose effects may not be apparent for days, months, years—or considering the psychic phase of all substance, for *incarnations?*

The public is consistently led to believe that immunization practice, figures, results and facts are as definitely dependable as the marking of time by an astronomical theodolite, so it is more than interesting to find Doctor Mainwaring stating that "the overwhelming clinical disappointments of the last fifty years" show the "errors and inadequacies of immunological theories from which proposed clinical methods were logical and consistent deductions." No immunological hypothesis of the past half-century, he says, has had a clinical verification probability of more than five per cent. And immunology, we have been insistently told, *is a science!* How long would any other branch of science carry that name, were its hypotheses verifiably wrong nineteen-twentieths of the time? No wonder, then, that Doctor Mainwaring calls for a new theory, "with basic hypotheses more nearly consistent with clinically verifiable fact!"[3]

And he produces one. For his own "new" explanatory theory of immunization, he goes straight to ancient Egypt, in a passage which deserves quotation in full:

> According to the predynastic Pavlovs of ancient Egypt a protein molecule is a minute, living, spiritually independent, self-propagating, materialized, or condensed animal or plant soul. This pulsating molecular individual injected into human tissues carries with it the gender, ambitions and tribal friendships of the animal or plant from which it was obtained. Introduced into human tissues, this minute alien personality may be excommunicated by the molecular subsouls of its human host. Or it may be enslaved and trained to cooperative service with human molecules. Desirable aliens may be adopted into full colloidal brotherhood with the human body, married to native somatic proteins, and become the parents of half-caste, quarter-caste or eighth-

---

[2]Drs. Alexander and Eyerman, *The Week's Science,* June 24, 1929.
[3]*Science,* July 5, 1929.

caste molecular hybrids. Mongrel proteins. Bastard colloids. Semi-permanent symbions with the human body. Eventually even raised to the dignity of sub-command.

The Ehrlich theory held that protective "antibodies" are generated in a body attacked mildly—or artificially—by some disease, and so, serving as security against heavier attacks. The new hypothesis assumes that the foreign proteins literally *hybridize* with the normal body cells, *making the substances affected half-human and half-animal.* He proves the case as to inter-animal serology. A thirty-day reaction from the serum of a dog into which horse protein has been injected, shows a precipitin reaction exactly half-way between that of horse and dog. "If this," he queries, "is not an actual semi-caninization of horse proteins, what is it?" The hybridization theory, he says, if true, must logically give certain prophecies which can be checked up. This is the first. The second is that the new protein should be self-propagating, able to thrive and increase its tribe in the new environment. We have already seen the experimental verification of this, to which he again refers. A third is that the mongrel or hybridized proteins may become permanently symbiotic with the human body; that is, may coexist and thrive indefinitely with and within the normal tissues. He produces experimental proof for this also.

From all this an almost endless series of unpredictable consequences arise. First, he suggests, in addition to "first-generation mongrels," second, third and even more remote hybridizations—and once more gives experimental data. The possibilities of such successive hybrids cannot be predicted or computed. They may be beneficial, inert, or destructive. Experiments with diphtheria bacteria show that its destructive power only arises from a hybridization with the serum of the body. With certain serum globulins the resulting hybrid is a specific antitoxin. With others it is inert. With still others? But Doctor Mainwaring does not speculate on that. Going further yet, however, we come to the *differential affinities* of a given type of tissues for certain proteins, or vice versa; as for instance, the reactions of bone marrow in a rabbit with *B. welchii* serum, resulting in a chronic and frequently fatal anemia of the whole system, while the same filtrate intravenously injected produced only a slight passing effect and ultimate immunization. If smallpox vaccine, typhoid toxin, antitoxin, etc., produce immunizing and seemingly harmless effects upon the human tissues with which they are *first* in contact, what of the substances with which they later come into connection during the tortuously complex processes of

after circulation, assimiliation, hybridization and sub-hybridization? Once more loom the ghastly inevitable specters of cancer and other things behind the uncertainty!

These things being seen, what is Doctor Mainwaring's recommendation—to eschew with horror all this internal and complicated *bestiality?* By no means! It is to seek measures by which uncertain hybrids can be made stable to the tissues, loyal to their purported duties? Yet Doctor Mainwaring comes far within Theosophical boundaries with many of his theses; first he speaks favorably of the *sub-personalities* informing the various tissues of the body, and closes his article thus:

> If you conceive the human body to be a mass of dead, inert material colloids, animated, coordinated and motivated by some great super-material vital purpose, this is all nonsense. But if you are attempting to explain biological organization on a purely material basis, you must seek the unit of vital phenomena in individual molecules, atoms and subatoms. Te be consistent you must endow the antigen molecule with just the same unit life as that proudly reserved for your own colloids.
>
> Breathe a metaphorical soul into the alien protein molecule.
>
> As soon as you have accustomed yourself to this theo-biochemical heresy, the ancient food hybridization theory emerges from the discarded superstitions of dead paganisms. A prophetic metaphor. The next great immunochemical challenge to pioneers and prospectors in clinical truth.
>
> As a challenge, rather than as demonstrated fact, I present it to you.

LIFE, THE TEACHER

So many people are "queer"—un-sane if not insane in their modes and tenses. We wonder why "our Karma" has placed us thus in contact with them, when we would have it so completely otherwise. Might this be part of the education Life, the beneficent teacher, is trying to afford us? If we considered the seemingly incongruous association that way, assuredly we *would* learn. And perhaps, even where much of the patent "queerness" really inheres! Or that in fact it is something else—merely another point of view. The Diamond Heart has many facets.

"THE RIGHT ENJOYER"

TO ENJOY life is not "untheosophical." Indeed, to the contrary, it is Theosophic duty, for *Soul* is free, happy, self-relying, sufficient. Its own nature *is* joy. On the "fragments of this bliss" is man's waking existence sustained. The right duty, then, is to preserve these fragments for right enjoyment, and not permit them to become polluted by careless or base use, through want of thought or want of heart.

A true application of this Theosophic principle may be made by *enjoying what we have,* instead of over-looking the immediate in fastening the eyes of desire on what we would like to have, and presently do not possess. Everybody, without exception, now owns something that is of the nature of joy—something by way of idea, or object, or relation, or condition, which is his very own, under Karma, and a radiating source of delight, satisfaction and enjoyment. Too often this possession—spiritual, mental or material—is accepted as a matter of course. The desires are so set upon a pictured condition which *would* bring happiness that the treasure already present is not sensed nor savored. The condition in itself indicates the immense potentialities of concentration; the being is so one-pointed that he is unaware of what he already has—proof of the masterly powers of even the least of men, and of their great possibilities, if gotten into leash, developed and constructively directed.

Instead of dwelling, then, upon the fancied enjoyments possible from what we have not, if we would abandon this illegal and stultifying use of the kingly power of imagination and set to, simply and full-heartedly, enjoying what we now have, "heaven on earth" would arrive for each one on that instant, and the "speech" of life would reveal itself as, not a cry, but a song!

Thereafter, natural and right development, looking towards wider, deeper and more abiding enjoyments, would suggest itself. Or, to express it in another way, the already charted and available Path to the glorious heights of Adeptship would present itself in such manner that we could *see it* as natural, practicable, inevitable. The Teachers say it is here before our eyes all the time—which, if true, indicates that somehow our eyes must be at fault.

He who is the user of what he now has, enjoyer of what he now has, is doing *all* that can be done, wherever he is. Moreover, such an one is "finding no fault"—condition precedent to induction into greater opportunity. Masters say They do what They *can*.

BRIDGES

WHAT a spirit of friendship stands expressed in these objects of human handicraft called "Bridges"! And have we noted the presence of the bridge-principle in so many other objects, and realized that this principle also reigns on the subjective side of Nature? A thought itself is but a bridge leading to another thought; thinking, but a bridge leading to action; action, a bridge leading to results; results, bridges leading to learning; and learning, the bridge which leads to helping. A bridge, then, is a symbol of brotherhood.

Yet, how often we cross a bridge in the world physical without a thought as to how it came to be there, nor care, save perhaps for its necessity on that highway over which we are traveling at breakneck speed.

Bridges range in variety from a mere rough log thrown over some obscure creek, to those of vast suspension uniting busy marts of men. There are long bridges and short, high bridges and low; some straight, some curved, made of stone, or wood, or steel, or combinations of these materials. Some bridges are stationary; others movable in whole or in part. Even draw-bridges are of many and varied types, ranging from those that were swung across moats surrounding warrior-castles of feudal days, to immense structures, which require but the touch of a button or the shifting of a lever to set them moving out of the way of commerce. But to most of us and most of the time, a bridge is just a bridge, a means of transport over an otherwise difficult or impassable gap.

To some, however, a bridge may be a thing of beauty in design; may stand as a majestic piece of engineering skill; but even few of these are grateful for the presence of the wonderful bridge they have just crossed, which enabled them to reach their point of vantage. Let us, without being too technical, observe a bridge in plain view, one of the single-span, overhead-arch type. Three main features will be detected in relation to our bridge: Approach, Abutment, and Span. The Approach is to be well considered, for long and painstaking calculations have entered into it on the part of the engineer. It is in this that he pays respect not only to the contemplated bridge, but also to all avenues leading to it. Where this respect has been fully paid, we find the project a harmonious whole, a thing of beauty as well as of utility.

The Abutment is that portion upon which the security of the

completed structure depends. Deep probing into the soil is necessary to ascertain possibilities for foundation. The laws of Nature may not be ignored with impunity in such enterprise any more than in any other; and no one knows this better than the conscientious bridge-builder. He knows that the law of "Compensation" has to be well studied, understood, and followed, or dire consequences ensue. Nature always exacts a balance. So, if at the site selected safe anchorage is not to be found, the engineer goes in search of another. Once suitable soil is found for the striking of foundations, there remain but details to be carried out; patience and perseverance in toil bring the Abutments, in proper proportion as to weight and size, to the point where they can receive and support the Span.

The Span, then, is the bridge proper—the portion which reaches from shore to shore, uniting two sides by passing over the rushing torrent beneath and between. Modern engineering has contrived this long, single Span by the use of the arch for central support; and this arch is ingeniously bound together for mutual strength by rods, bolts, beams, and braces. Examination of these various parts, all named in the peculiar vernacular of the bridge-builder, will reveal an application of the "lever-principle." It can be readily seen that enormous weights require firm foundations indeed for support. Said Archimedes: "Give me whereon to stand, and I will move the world." Said Mr. Judge: "Give me five hundred earnest and devoted men and women, and I will theosophise the world."

It is over the Span of the bridge that the world of men does move. And what an impersonal servant the Span is! It carries on its patient back, "rich man, poor man, beggar-man, thief," "butcher, baker, and candlestick maker," and never questions the pilgrims as to the purpose of their journeyings. Like an impartial arbiter, too, it holds apart two opposite sides, yet unites in a common cause portions of cities and country-sides, counties, states and nations. Can we not, then, read in our bridge true religion, true philosophy, and true science? For it is true religion which binds together; true philosophy explains why this must be so; and true science teaches how.

Is there such a Bridge among men, comprised of these great elements of all Life? Theosophy is that Bridge. Its Abutments are rooted deep as Nature itself, and are as ancient and secure. The Span reaches "from shore to shore of the evolution of sentient beings." The Approach can be made by any man who *wills*, and even children will not be afraid to cross it. It exacts no "toll," other than devotion to a Cause, which, once attained, spells freedom for

all mankind and emancipation for all that lives. The Elder Brothers of the Race, the Masters of Wisdom, are the Custodians of this Bridge, and They guard it and preserve it *now*, as in the past. For They know that all who travel Life's highway will sometime make their way from morass of ignorance and despair to this Bridge, which leads with certainty to avenues of "fortune, victory, wealth, and wise action." And these Elder Brothers, "having Themselves crossed over the ocean of conditioned existence" by way of the Bridge of learning, are aware of the awakening in men's minds towards questioning of Life's mysteries. They have referred to this awakening as an "age of transition," when the Bridge of true learning is needed indeed!

Once man's attention has been drawn again to the great, underlying truth that he himself is "the Eternal, the fearless Eternal," he will begin to assume in real earnest his own individual and personal responsibility, which stands as an approach to the investigation into the laws of his being. He will perceive and assume as perfect justice, that where he now finds himself is exactly the place *he* brought himself to, that whatever he is now reaping, he must have sown. The doctrine of Reincarnation acts for him as Span between cause and effect, between action and reaction. The gaps, which reason alone could not bridge, begin to disappear. The great postulates of Theosophy, pondered and applied, will show him that: "Man is but a link in an endless chain of being; a sequence of a past eternity of causes and processes; a potentiality born into time, but spanning two eternities, his past and his future, and in his consciousness these are all one, *Duration*, the *ever-present*."

H. P. Blavatsky once wrote, among many other statements pointing to Universal Brotherhood: "If *my* consciousness is *separate* from anything in time, space, substance or causality, how could contact arrive? By what bridge the Void?" W. Q. Judge answered, as every man might well answer: "The conclusion is irresistible: only in an actual Unity could an idea, even of separateness, arise. The corollary is likewise irresistible: all separateness is in idea. That which separates also unites. If our *attitude of mind* is changed we shall verily soon begin to see all things and creatures in the Self and the Self in all. Nature does in fact exist for the sake of the Soul's experience and emancipation, and down to the smallest atom all is soul and spirit ever evolving under the rule of law inherent in the whole."

Such great truths are the Bridge which spans the voids of ignorance as to man's nature; the wide gulfs of separativeness, hate and

intolerance; and the chasms through which flow torrents of desires and passions. So also will each one find for himself, after respectful approach has been made, that "Man has never been without a friend." These friends of the Race, the Elder Brothers, may be truly called the Bridge from human to Divine.

In our own time have been such. They worked like engineers, clearing away the jungle-growth of false ideas from the Path which leads to knowledge of moral fitness and of Brotherhood. H. P. Blavatsky *planned* the work as only a great Architect could; William Q. Judge *worked the plan;* and Robert Crosbie recognized the Architect, honored Her friend and co-worker, and therefore *understood* the Plan. It is due to his unceasing toil that jungle-growth was prevented from once more obscuring the Path to the Bridge. "Unity, Study, and Work"; "One Aim, one Purpose, one Teaching"; "The Three Fundamental Propositions of Theosophy: Life, Law and Being:" These tripartite sayings he showed to be the three main features of the Bridge of work in the world, as Respect, Gratitude and the Will to *go on* are the Approach, the Abutment and the Span of the Bridge which leads to a realization of Immortality, wherein disappear all gulfs, all chasms, all sense of separateness.

Do What You Can

As I do not always know just what ought to be done, I must stand on what Master says: "Do what you *can,* if you ever expect to see Them." This being true, and another Adept saying, "Follow the Path They and I show, but do not follow *my* path," why then, all we can do, whether great or small, is to do just what we can, each in his proper place. It is sure that if we have an immense devotion and do our best, the result will be right for Them and us, even though we would have done otherwise had we known more when we were standing on a course of action. A devoted Chela once said: "I do not mind all these efforts at explanation and all this trouble, for I always have found that that which was done in Master's name was right and came out right." What is done in those names is done without thought of self, and motive is the essential test.—*W. Q. J.*

THE CHAIN OF LIFE

THE whole universe is made up of spirit and matter, both constituting together the Absolute. What is not matter is spirit, and what is not spirit is matter; but there is no particle of matter without spirit, and no particle of spirit without matter. If this attempted definition is correct, you will see that it is impossible to define the things of the spirit, and that has always been said by great Teachers of the past. Spirit-matter contains both consciousness *per se*, and all possible states of matter from the finest to the coarsest. These states are evolved individually for individual experience, and also collectively for collective experience, each individual proceeding on his own line, and in accordance with the general progress of the mass of beings. Changes of matter take place in regular sequence by the force or energy of the mass, of which energy each individual supplies his portion. This energy might be called consciousness in action or the force of ideation, the lesser entities being guided in their energy by the greater, and more progressed.

Also hold in mind that Spirit and Substance are co-existent and co-eternal. We are higher beings clothed in bodies made up of small lives on this plane. We call these lives "matter," but they are matter only relatively, because we can mould them. To themselves they are conscious in their way, receiving impress from us, but not recognizing the source of the impress nor its import. We are their incognizable universe in which they live, move and have their being; our light adds to theirs, as ours is added to by the impress from still higher beings. So there is a chain of life and consciousness which gradually tends to fuller and fuller individualization of being in non-separateness—the more complete the individualization, the more full the sense of non-separateness.

This quotation from H. P. B. may be helpful. "At the 'Day be with us' every Ego has to remember all the cyles of his past reincarnations *for Manvantaras* . . . It sees the stream of its past incarnations by a certain divine light. It sees all humanity at once, but still there is ever, as it were, a stream which is always the 'I'."

The place where the line of involution and evolution meet is in the incarnation of the descending gods—ourselves—in the highest evolved form. The analogy is seen in any reincarnation. The consciousness leaves the body, which goes to pieces on its own

plane. When the real man returns, he has to wait until the lower lives have built up a form for him into which he may enter, this form being built under the impress given by the real man in other lives. A Manvantara is an enlarged and expanded similar process. We came from the Moon, where we had evolved form to a degree. At pralaya all things stopped evolution of form; on re-manifestation, the lower lives or "builders" began to build up as before, and as their impress and previous building admitted. When the form of man had reached the highest previous point reached, the *Kumaras*, or real men, overshadowed and entered to carry the evolution further. "They, and no other, are we."

—Robert Crosbie.

A Preparatory Cycle

Herein lies the very gist of the cycle's meaning. It is a preparatory cycle with much of necessary destruction in it; for, before construction, we must have some disintegration. We are preparing here in America a new race which will exhibit the perfection of the glories that I said were being slowly brought to the surface from the long forgotten past. This is why the Americas are seen to be in a perpetual ferment. It is the seething and bubbling of the older races in the refining-pot, and the slow coming up of the material for the new race. Here, and nowhere else, are to be found men and women of every race living together, being governed together, attacking nature and the problems of life together, and bringing forth children who combine, each one, two races. This process will go on until in the course of many generations there will be produced on the American continents an entirely new race; new bodies; new orders of intellect; new powers of the mind; curious and unheard-of psychic powers, as well as extraordinary physical ones; with new senses and extensions of present senses now unforeseen. When this new sort of body and mind are generated—then other monads, or our own again, will animate them and paint upon the screen of time the pictures of 100,000 years ago.—*W. Q. J.*

INFLUENCES

MEN are Karmic agents, because even the least of men is partly conscious, partly awake to the fact that all his actions affect others as well as himself. It is but a reversal of perception, not of fact, to realize that each man is as constantly being affected by the actions of others. These two poles of action are no more separate, one from the other, than wave and hollow: the one does not, because it cannot, exist without the other.

Every motion of our consciousness produces "speech" in one part of our nature, silence in the rest; accord or rebellion. Union or separateness, not as abstractions but as vital realities, is the timeless and eternal, because instant, reaction to our every action. The same with all other men; the same with the warp and woof of every interaction between men. To remember another is instantly to be in contact with him, to be in conjunction or in opposition: to awaken and set in action one or more of the "principles" in his nature and in our own—for the weal or woe of both of us. Nor does the current end there, for his principles and ours are no private, personal, or even individual possession. Each of us is a centre where meet and mingle innumerable radial lines of force, every one of them instantly in tune to our changing tensions of thought, will, and feeling. We "broadcast" to the Universe—a living universe. Who knows what psychic radios in all the seven worlds are "listening in" on the silent speech of the mind when we fancy ourselves in utter privacy and solitude? One has but to reverse the simile to recognize that we are all both sending and receiving "messages." We are in "wireless communication" with Eternity—with past and future as well as present; with all mankind as well as with the immediate friend or foe or stranger.

Two facts stare us in the face: that "seven-principled man" is only *partially* awake to the godlike or demoniacal effect on others, on the whole of nature, of his exercise of these universal powers, these limitless radiations of his own essential being; that being still ignorant of this never-ending sweep of our powers, of the universal scope of the influences exercised by and on each one of us, all men are victims to their misuse of their innate and truly Divine powers. What, then is man, so mighty in his powers, so ignorant and therefore heedless in his use of them, to do?

First: to recognize the facts; second: to seek to understand them. Recognition and understanding lead directly to discrimination, as

discrimination to wise judgment. Choice and will are inseparable. Since the facts are universal, the attempt to understand them must set no limits, draw no exclusion lines, show no bias for or against any thing, any being—or the attempt is foredoomed to failure. We can and do reach and influence to speech or silence, to union or separateness, the highest as the lowest, the worst as the best in all Nature. Not a thought, not a desire, not a feeling, not a memory or an imagination, but links us instantly to devachan or kamaloka, to nirvana or avitchi. We have some sense of orientation physically: the universe stretches north, south, east, west, up and down from wherever we may be. We take our bearings as the essential prerequisite to remaining where we are, or traveling in any direction. Understanding is metaphysical orientation. What do the mental facts say to us? Where are we standing at this moment as a body of thought? Is it where we wish to be? What are the six directions in invisible space?—in psychic space, in intellectual space, in spiritual space—for the world invisible has its "three dimensions" as surely as physical space.

The so-called "principles" are but names for the six directions in which the immortal Pilgrim (who is the Seventh Principle) may look to see the "facts" as reflected in his own present state of mind or consciousness; may gain orientation; may choose with open mind as he has seen with open eyes; may tread his path in Light instead of darkness. This is a universe of light as well as darkness—the light of Wisdom as well as the darkness of ignorance. This is a universe of understanding as well as misconception—of union as well as separateness. This is a world of works as well as of facts—of sowing as well as of reaping. And in all the three worlds of thought and will and feeling our spheres of being interpenetrate those of all others, "men, gods, and the elemental beings." We influence them and they influence us—consciously or unconsciously.

"Without moving, O Holder of the Bow, is the traveling on this Path."

CHAOS OR KOSMOS?

"HOW do we know that Theosophy alone is in possession of the truth? May not the claims of non-theosophic bodies, such as the scientists be correct—the claim, for example, that life is ultimately triumphant on the destructive side and that even for man death ends all?" That this type of question should be frequently asked by inquirers is not to be wondered at. Were it not so asked, there would be little need for Theosophic propaganda in the world. Are we not taught, and is it not impressed upon our minds from early childhood, that life holds mysteries that are utterly unanswerable and that even to inquire into them is either folly or blasphemy? Both materialistic science and sectarian religion are alike in their contention that not only does no one possess any reliable knowledge regarding things metaphysical and spiritual but that knowledge of this sort is *non est*. For them the universe is not only full of unsolved but also of insoluble problems. Humanity, accustomed to regard itself as the helpless pawn of an Almighty God or of almighty blind force shrinks from the bold assertion of Theosophy that in its philosophy there is no unsolvable mystery anywhere in nature. How are we to meet this constant challenge of the race-mind?

Reduced to still simpler terms, man, ever since his descent and immersion in matter, has been asking himself: "Is the universe a chaos or an ordered and harmonious kosmos?" It cannot be both. Yet the inevitable inferences, to be drawn from the dogmas of religion and the theories of science, is that the universe is part kosmos and part chaos, part law and part lawless. The existence of miracle means the triumph of lawlessness, since miracle by its very nature is capable of setting aside and transcending all law. The same conclusion must logically be drawn from the position taken by many scientists, that the universe in addition to exhibiting law is also ruled by chance and accident. If it could be shown that law falls down anywhere in the boundless infinitudes of visible and invisible space, then what man ordinarily knows as law could be nothing more than an aspect of chaos. As a house divided against itself cannot stand so the universe is unthinkable as half a kosmos and half a chaos. It is all one or the other. Put in this way, hardly anybody but can see the axiomatic character of the statement that the universe must be governed by law through and through. In the final analysis, the concept of nature as a kosmos is a matter of direct perception rather

than of proof. This direct perception will be found reinforced and fortified by daily experience, once man has learned to read the book of life aright. As the second fundamental of the *Secret Doctrine* puts it:

> "This second assertion of the *Secret Doctrine* is the absolute universality of that law of periodicity, of flux and reflux, ebb and flow, which physical science has observed and recorded in all departments of nature. An alternation such as Day and Night, Life and Death, Sleeping and Waking is a fact so common, so perfectly universal and without exception, that it is easy to comprehend that in it we see one of the absolutely fundamental laws of the universe."

The acquisition of knowledge is not so much a matter of addition as it is of subtraction. To see, is simply a matter of the successive removal of veils and spiritual cataracts which stand between one's vision and the Reality. These cataracts are caused by the *rajasic* and *tamasic* qualities; by the passions and desires, and by inertia and indifference:

> "Know that the wisdom which perceives in all nature one single principle indivisible and incorruptible, not separate in the separate objects seen, is of the *sattva* quality. The knowledge which perceives different and manifold principles as present in the world of created beings pertains to *rajas*, the quality of passion. But that knowledge, wholly without value, which is mean, attached to one object alone as if it were the whole, which does not see the true cause of existence, is of the nature of *tamas*, indifferent and dark." *(Bhagavad-Gita,* Chapter XVIII).

Sectarian religion fits perfectly the above description of those whose knowledge is of the *tamasic* quality. For does not every sect fanatically contend that its particular God, its particular savior, its particular dogmas and forms are the whole truth and the only road to salvation? Law is replaced by miracle and the One Reality is reduced to a Being possessed of the passions and despotism of the most selfish of men. Materialistic science fits the description of those whose knowledge is of *rajas*. For does not science see different and manifold principles in the universe? Does not science constantly shift the basis of its knowledge with its ever-changing theories, speculations, and hypotheses? Theosophy alone is the wisdom pertaining to the *sattva* quality; for it alone sees in nature one single principle, indivisible and incorruptible.

> "It is the ONE LIFE, eternal, invisible, yet Omnipresent, without beginning or end, yet periodical in its regular manifestations, between which periods reigns the dark mystery of non-Being; unconscious, yet absolute Consciousness; unrealisable, yet the one self-existing reality; truly, 'a chaos to the sense, a Kosmos to the reason.'" *(S. D.* I, p. 2.*)*

Direct spiritual perception cannot manifest unless we first uproot all preconceptions which play havoc with our minds. We cannot expect truth to negotiate terms with us; it is rather for us to surrender ourselves *unconditionally* to It. The former attitude of mind has been the stumbling block of all those who have departed from the original teachings and the original lines of work. Instead of coming to the ancient and eternal Wisdom as little children, unaffected and unafraid, they came with reservations, terms and challenges; they wanted to surrender nothing; they demanded Truth on their own terms; they sought in Theosophy something to fit in with and justify what they already believed.

Since all recognise, in part at least, the reign of law, from this point let us enlarge the conception and gradually show that law is absolutely universal in its scope. The subject of karma will always enable us to proceed from the known to the unknown and to link up known experiences with their, as yet, unknown causes. There are aspects of karma which will not overwhelm the understanding of a child, while there are other aspects which will test the comprehension of a sage. For karma is coeval and coeternal with the whole of the manifested universe, and hence it embraces all possible knowledge. We can only know life in its endless and periodic processes of being and becoming. Its essential and immutable Unity is unthinkable and unknowable. We sense it by a series of progressive realizations, each realization being the lifting of an additional veil, but *no final veil can ever be lifted.*

> "According to the Esoteric philosophy, this Deity is during its 'nights' and its 'days' *(i.e.,* cycles of rest or activity*)* 'the *eternal perpetual motion,*' 'the EVER-BECOMING, as well as the ever universally present, and ever Existing.' The latter is the root-abstraction, the former—the only possible conception in human mind, if it disconnects this deity from any shape or form. It is a perpetual, never-ceasing evolution, circling back in its incessant progress through aeons of duration into its original status—ABSOLUTE UNITY." *(S. D.* II, p. 545*).*

Karma is deity in action, the manifestation of the eternal, perpetual motion, the ever-becoming, and this is "the only possible conception in human mind if it disconnects this deity from any shape or form." This conception of deity, *i.e.,* the ever-becoming, is within the range and reach of all beings; but unless the results of one's study lead one to the concept of Absolute Unity to which all manifestation incessantly cycles back, one is lost in the labyrinth of that motion itself and sees naught but a blind, purposeless universe—a veritable

chaos. The Occult Catechism contains the following questions and answers:

> *"What is it that ever is?" "Space, the eternal Anupadaka." "What is it that ever was?" "The Germ in the Root." "What is it that is ever coming and going?" "The Great Breath." "Then, there are three Eternals?" "No, the three are one. That which ever is is one, that which ever was is one, that which is ever being and becoming is also one: and this is Space." (S. D. I, p. 11).*

There is in reality but ONE fundamental, having three aspects; the aspect that ever is—the eternal immutable and secondless Reality, which neither manifests nor goes out of manifestation; the manifesting aspect which ever was and which is "the coeternal and coeval emanation or inherent radiation" of the secondless Reality; the aspect that is ever coming and going, the Great Breath, the eternal perpetual motion of the universe. But there is only One Eternal, and the aim and end of all knowledge and all evolution is that realization. This realization makes one an "unconditioned *Mukti*," an immortal perfected Being.

What is that faculty whereby the limitations of the mind and the ordinary human mode of comprehension can be transcended and by the aid of which Unity can be realized? Theosophy teaches that there is such a faculty, and it is as common as the air we breathe. Like most things that are right within and immediately outside of our environment, the majority overlook it. It is a synthetic power and operates inversely to purely intellectual processes. Its seat is in the essential rather than in the acquired nature of man and of all beings. It is a mode of *living* rather than a mode of thinking. This is an important distinction. There are too many Theosophists and would-be occultists who imagine that the way to attain to superior and direct knowledge of metaphysical truths is to indulge in what they call *yoga* exercises. Thus there are many who would wrest from Nature her secrets by means of breathing exercises, "going into the silence," and various sorts of so-called "concentration" exercises. They hope that by these means they will be treated to an influx of wisdom from higher spheres. Sharp and unmistakable warnings have been given in every age against such practices by the only ones competent to advise in matters of this kind—the adepts. But Masters have done more than simply warn. They have set forth the true way. Their method is the unremitting practice of the highest and truest ethics; for only through such practice, can the devotee be brought to a realization of the essential oneness of all life. All other roads are blind alleys.

No one can treat of any Theosophical subject without finding that one end of the thread of the argument leads to the basic proposition of the spiritual unity and brotherhood of all life. While we are immersed in the bewildering mazes of diversified life which characterizes existence in matter, we are safe if we remember that the thread of life stretches from infinity to infinity, and that not one particle, atom or unit of any kind, whether visible or invisible can be disjointed without its due effect on the boundless kosmos.

Just as we cannot separate the Three Fundamentals of the *Secret Doctrine,* and view them as unrelated propositions, so we cannot separate the three objects of the parent Theosophical Society or, for that matter, of the Theosophical Movement. And just as the second and third fundamentals are comprehended in, and arise from the first; so the second and third objects of the Theosophical Movement are barren without the first. Any tendency to view the three objects of the Theosophical Movement separately will result in viewing the metaphysical fundamentals separately. This is why those who either inwardly scorned or merely tolerated the first object, which had to do with the establishment of a nucleus of universal brotherhood without distinctions of any kind, soon crystallized the unknowable deific essence which is the subject of the first fundamental into an extra-cosmic deity, more or less unrelated to the countless units in the throes of evolution. There is also a tendency on the part of "separatists" to regard the second object as justifying the existence of creeds as such and to harden and debase the Theosophical Movement into a sect. The third object viewed as unrelated to the other two will inevitably lead to the development of the lower *Iddhi* or psychic faculties, and it was for those ignorant of the dangers of the lower *Iddhi* that the *Voice of the Silence* was written —a book which makes unbounded compassion the *sine qua non* of true occult growth.

Separateness, whether of thought or action, leads to a view of the universe as a chaos. Separateness is, therefore, the great and only heresy. Non-separateness of thought and action leads to the realization of the universe as an ordered and harmonious kosmos; and it is this abiding faith in the law of universal compassion which will alone save the wayfarer from the pitfalls of *maya,* or from a universe of chaos and confusion.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS

"Once more the elder brothers have indicated where the truth—Theosophy—could be found, and the companions all over the world are engaged in bringing it forth for wider currency and propagation."

"I don't want to appear as Mrs. Grumble, but now that we are all together, I would like your opinion on something that has been troubling me." Beverly Marks spoke the words with a worried look.

"Tell us, Bev," spoke up Carl Winter, "why, you know, I'm Mr. Fixit himself."

"Count yourself, you're not so many!" warned Tom Dunbar, who thought that Beverly was "just keen."

Beverly herself had not known her Theosophical companions for a very long time, but considered them the finest friends she had ever had. "It seems to me, that ever since I have come in contact with Theosophy, and been really interested and done some studying of my own, my whole life has been changed; not only mine, but the rest of the family as well. I feel more satisfied with my circumstances and secure in the feeling that my life is of my own making. I don't grope in the darkness, as I used to do, and ask questions without receiving satisfactory answers. I feel calmer and more peaceful than of old, but at the same time, I have never had such bad luck in a material way, as I have had since Theosophy was introduced to me."

"What sort of 'bad luck,' Beverly?" asked Helen Martin.

"Well, the family has lost a lot of money. Practically all of my father's business engagements have floundered on the rocks. Our house burned down, and all my clothes with it; Junior fell from a tree and cut his head rather seriously, and as you know, my ankle is just recovering from a very bad sprain. Then there are so many little things; nothing seems to go right any more. The other day it occurred to me that all these things had never happened to us before the advent of Theosophy in our lives and I have wondered whether that has anything to do with it." Beverly faced her companions in real earnest.

The group was silent and considering.

"I have heard of similar cases," offered Carl, helpfully.

"That people who become interested in Theosophy have a lot of bad luck?" asked Beverly in astonishment.

"I guess that is what it amounts to."

"Don't you think," suggested Helen, "that as Theosophy teaches

we must pay our own debts, a knowledge of that fact precipitates a great many effects of actions previously set in motion?"

"That seems logical," said Beverly.

"It's like putting an advertisement in the newspaper," vouched Tom. "You advertise that you are willing to pay all past debts here and now, and all your debtors come rushing to you all at once. As Helen said, Theosophy makes you realize that you alone are responsible, Karmically, and so you lay yourself open to all different forces, and may have seeming 'bad luck' all at once."

"That is why I must learn to take it without bitterness," replied Beverly.

"And say, you must not forget that it isn't all 'bad,' relatively speaking," said Carl cheerfully. "Weren't you just telling us that you have had an inner spiritual calm since your knowledge of Theosophy?"

"Yes indeed," said Beverly, "and the joy of that knowledge is so much greater than all the other events, because I know that they are not lasting."

"There is something else that has helped me a lot, Beverly," said Helen. "A friend of mine once told me never to regard anything as 'bad luck,' but just a test of our own strength in understanding the lessons which we must learn."

Beverly considered the last statement. "I suppose that the only 'examinations' we have in Life, are those tests which will upset our temper, make us lose our good nature and irritate us beyond all reason."

"That certainly is the case," replied Carl, "and that is the *Kamic* nature working every time."

"Is that the fourth principle in the nature of man?" asked Beverly.

"Yes, it is," said Carl, who had fortunately studied the topic in his Sunday class and could therefore answer with great assurance.

"And the feeling that comes from realizing Theosophic Truths is of an entirely different nature," said Tom. "It's the higher nature in each of us."

"And don't forget, Bev," said Helen, "that the reward of having contacted Theosophy is infinitely greater than any material misfortunes that may come to you."

"Of course," laughed Beverly; "don't make a tragedy of it, it really is not so bad as it sounds. And thank you for helping me. I'm sure that you have improved my state of mind!"

JESUS: INITIATE AND TEACHER

IV

IN what particular does the jealous, wrathful, revengeful God of Israel resemble the unknown deity, the God of mercy preached by Jesus;—*his* Father who is in Heaven, and the Father of all humanity? This Father alone is the God of spirit and purity, and, to compare Him with the subordinate and capricious Sinaitic Deity is an error. Did Jesus ever pronounce the name Jehovah? Did he ever place *his* Father in contrast with this severe and cruel Judge; his God of mercy, love, and justice, with the Jewish genius of retaliation?

Never! From that memorable day when he preached his Sermon on the Mount, an immeasurable void opened between his God and that other deity who fulminated his commands from that other mount —Sinai. The language of Jesus is unequivocal; it implies not only rebellion but defiance of the Mosaic "Lord God." "Ye have heard," he tells us, "that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but *I say* unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. Ye have heard that it hath been said (by the same "Lord God" on Sinai): Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But *I say* unto you; Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." (*Matthew* v.).

When dying on the cross, the martyred Man of Sorrows forgave his enemies. His last words were a prayer in their behalf. He taught his disciples to curse not, but to bless, even their foes.

There was but one apostle of Jesus worthy of that name, and that was Paul. However disfigured were his *Epistles* by dogmatic hands before being admitted into the Canon, his conception of the great and divine philosopher who died for his idea can still be traced in his addresses to the various Gentile nations. Only, he who would understand him better yet must study the Philonean *Logos* reflecting now and then the Hindu *Sabda* (logos) of the Mimansa school.

In the writings of Paul, the entity of man is divided into a trine—flesh, psychical existence or *soul*, and the overshadowing and at the same time interior entity or SPIRIT. His phraseology is very definite, when he teaches the *anastasis*, or the continuation of life of those who have died. He maintains that there is a *psychical* body which is

sown in the corruptible, and a spiritual body that is raised in incorruptible substance. . . . Jesus makes the *heart* what Paul says of the flesh.

Alas, alas! How little has the divine seed, scattered broadcast by the hand of the meek Judean philosopher, thrived or brought forth fruit. He, who himself had shunned hypocrisy, warned against public prayer, showing such contempt for any useless exhibition of the same, could he but cast his sorrowful glance on the earth, from the regions of eternal bliss, would see that this seed fell neither on sterile rock nor by the way-side. Nay, it took deep root in the most prolific soil; one enriched even to plethora with lies and human gore!

If the alleged founder of the Christian religion is now, after the lapse of nineteen centuries, preached—more or less unsuccessfully however—in every corner of the globe, we are at liberty to think that the doctrines attributed to him would astonish and dismay him more than anyone else. A system of deliberate falsification was adopted from the first. When the memory of the meek and lowly Jesus still lingered lovingly in every Christian heart, and his words of mercy and charity vibrated still in the air, even then the Christians were outdoing the Pagans in every kind of ferocity and religious intolerance. Truly says Bishop Kidder: "Were a wise man to choose his religion from those who profess it, perhaps Christianity would be the last religion he would choose!"

Renan makes of Jesus a sort of sentimental ninny, a theatrical simpleton, enamored of his own poetical divagations and speeches, wanting every one to adore him, and finally caught in the snares of his enemies. Such was not Jesus, the Jewish philanthropist, the adept and mystic of a school now forgotten by the Christians and the Church—if ever it was known to her; the hero, who preferred even to risk death, rather than withhold some truths which he believed would benefit humanity.

It is in Palestine that we have to search for the *clearest* waters of Christianity, let alone its source. The first Christians, after the death of Jesus, all joined together for a time, whether they were Ebionites, Nazarenes, Gnostics, or others. They had no Christian dogmas in those days, and their Christianity consisted in believing Jesus to be a prophet, this belief varying from seeing in him simply a "just man," or a holy, inspired prophet, a vehicle used by Christos and Sophia to manifest themselves through. These all united together in opposition to the synagogue and the tyrannical technicalities of the Pharisees, until the primitive group separated in two distinct branches—which, we may correctly term the Christian kabalists of

the Jewish Tanaïm school, and the Christian kabalists of the Platonic Gnosis. The former were represented by the party composed of the followers of Peter, and John, the author of the *Apocalypse;* the latter ranged with the Pauline Christianity, blending itself, at the end of the second century, with the Platonic philosophy, and engulfing, still later, the Gnostic sects, whose symbols and misunderstood mysticism overflowed the Church of Rome.

Amid this jumble of contradictions, what Christian is secure in confessing himself such?

(Collated from the writings of H.P.B.)
(To be continued)

Purpose of the Work

What we do now in this transition age will be like what the great Dhyan Chohans did in the transition point—the midway point—in evolution at the time when all matter and all types were in a transition and fluid state. They then gave the new impulse for the new types, which resulted later in the vast varieties of nature. In the mental development we are now at the same point and what we now do in faith and hope for others and for ourselves will result similarly on the plane to which it is all directed. Thus in other centuries we will come out again and go on with it. If we neglect it now, so much the worse for us then. Hence we are not working for some definite organisation of the new years to come, but for a change in the Manas and Buddhi of the Race. That is why it may seem indefinite, but it is, nevertheless, very defined and very great in scope. Let me refer you to that part of *The Secret Doctrine,* penned by Master Himself, where the midway point of evolution is explained in reference to the ungulate mammals. It should give you a glimpse of what we have to do, and remove all vain longings for a present sojourn with our unseen guides and brothers. The world is not free from superstition, and we, a part of it, must have some traces left of the same thing. They have said that a great shadow follows all innovations in the life of humanity; the wise one will not bring on that shadow too soon and not until some light is ready to fall at the same time for breaking up the darkness.—*W. Q. J.*

HIDDEN HINTS IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE*

(From p. 160 to p. 184. I).

By W. Q. J.

MARS and Mercury bear an occult relation to the earth which will not be explained. *V. I. p. 163.* This is not because no explanation exists, but because, as said *(p. 164 footnote)*, these explanations belong to high grades of initiation.

Figures and Numbers the key to the whole system; *V. I. p. 164, last line.* This has often been stated. Among the Jewish cabalists it is said that the Universe is built by number, weight, and measure, and that harmony is the law reigning over all. Now if the hint given be true, that figures and numbers *will not* be given for the above reasons, then it is useless for students to bother their minds about the occult meaning of numbers, as so many now do; for this occult meaning cannot be found without assistance.

Venus in her 7th Round. See italicised para. *on p. 165,* where it is said that that planet is in her last round. This must be her 7th. Hence the men there are as gods to us, and, if the argument from analogy is to be relied on, some of her great light must emanate from those beings and not all be from the sun.

Mars with two moons not his own. See *p. 164, ital. para.* This is taken from the letter by a Master who, replying to the query as to why Mercury and Venus have no satellites, says: "It is because Mars has two to which he has no right and—for other reasons." That is, we infer that Mars absorbed these moons or dragged them off into his orbit at some time enormously distant and still keeps them. They cannot therefore stand to him in the same relation as our moon does to us. One of the "other reasons" may be that, Venus being in her 7th round, all vestiges of old moons have been sublimated and absorbed into her atmosphere.

Esoteric Metaphysics must be understood. *V. I. p. 169 last para.* This rule is laid down by the Adepts and is therefore of greater weight than if formulated by a student. It is useless to attempt to master the system on the lines of modern research, which at best are empirical, very faulty, and leading almost always to a materialization of the whole scheme. Metaphysic deals with the real because the ideal, and physical science with the phenomenal and therefore illusory and changeable.

---

*From *The Path,* May, 1891.

Evolution of the Monad a basic principle. *P. 171, 1st line, V. I.* This is laid down with extreme clearness and should not be forgotten. It is not expanded so that inattentive minds may get it through much repetition, but it is postulated once for all. It is still altogether too customary for students to separate the Monads, first from the globes and then from the beings thereon. They cannot be thus divided off. All the globes and their objects are and ever will be monads in stages of evolution, just as we who now study the question are monads ourselves in other stages. The false notion should at once be discarded that there was a time when there were no monads on the globe but that there was here in waiting this ball of earth coming from no one knows where, and that later on monads arrived to occupy it.

If we carry out the principle laid down, then the globe is the creation of the monad; and when the globe is evolved, at once monads needing that experience enter into its corporeality to continue its existence. These later monads are those far behind in the race who will, in some succeeding period of evolution, be in a position to evolve on their own account some new globe in ages yet far distant, for the carrying on of the same process eternally. For, as a material object cannot spring out of nothing, neither can education or knowledge or ability to plan arise out of nothing, but must be based upon and flow from some prior experience or education. So it must be that even now there are monads encased in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms which have never been farther than that, and will during the remainder of the race evolution continue their education in those lower kingdoms until their time shall come when, the door opening for their exit, they will pass out and higher to make room for others.

Limit to number of Monads. Although there can be no such thing as a metaphysical limit to the monads, yet practically, for the purposes of any one manvantara, there must be limited number of monads included within its evolutionary sweep. Since a manvantara, however vast and inconceivable by us, is wholly a finite period, it sets its own limit—within the illimitable absolute—for the monads attracted to it. This of necessity must be, since the natural world which makes experience possible, being finite because material, sets the limit by reason of its capacity being bounded. *See 1st para. p. 171, V. I.*

The Fate of the Anthropoid Apes. This interesting question is raised first on *pp. 173 and 175 V. I.* and not disposed of. There, in describing the course of the evolution of the monad, it is said that the laggards will not be men at all in this cycle *save one exception.* On

p. 184, 2d para. it seems to be answered. "In this Round . . . the anthropoids destined to die out in this our race when their monads will be liberated and pass into the astral human forms, or the highest human elementals, of the sixth and seventh Races, and then into the lowest human forms in the fifth Round." These descendants of men through union with animals will thus be karmically rewarded in the next round after this, instead of having to wait until another manvantara.

FROM A STUDENT'S NOTE-BOOK

The old Biblical idea of creating something out of nothing still persists in the minds of many students of Theosophy, although they are unaware of the fact. The "Naught was" of the Stanzas means, to them, the utter extinction of everything—even of "matter." What would create it again, if the fallacy of an extra cosmic God be admitted? And into what dust-bin of Nature would it be swept, if "annihilated"? True enough, organized *forms* come and go, but the ultimate Essence out of which they are originated does not come and go. It ever is. This is the *Mulaprakriti* of the ancient texts; but to name it, is not to apprehend it. "That which is neither Spirit nor Matter" is the Perceiver of *Mulaprakriti.*

The word "Universe" is used in at least two senses in the Teachings. One implies this Solar System; the second, the Kosmos. Can a human mind do anything else than fore-shorten and limit the latter? That "Universe", then, is to each one, *all that he can grasp* of Kosmos. Thus, when it is said, "the Universe returns into the Unmanifested", we must admit that, so far as we can know, there may be countless other "Universes" still in manifestation in Space, which is a symbol of Kosmos. For *us,* however, the whole of manifestation has ceased to be. Such considerations aid in breaking down the self-limitations, and Creator-God ideas that are barriers to the expansion of human conceptions in the present cycle.

If there are *Para-Nirvanees*—beings so universal in their Individuality that They are "awake" during *Nirvana,* there must be "substance" even when manifestation ceases. For even the most sublimated *being* can but exist in the unit-Substance. Such Glorious Ones might be thought of as Presences, their universal essence everywhere, and not to be conceived in terms of *form*. Perchance the formless Universe *is* their "form" when functioning as *Para-Nirvanees.* Such might be the "divine form" of Krishna glimpsed in the 11th Chapter of *Bhagavad-Gita.*

SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

QUESTION: What *is* the final state, as taught in Theosophy? The Christians have Heaven, the Hindus, *Moksha,* and the Buddhists, Nirvana, but while Theosophy speaks of all three in varying terms, it seems to imply there is an end to all of them, Devachan, Heaven, Hell, whatnot.

Answer: Theosophy teaches that no *state* is final: they all have a "beginning," and hence must have an "end." All the terms mentioned are *religious* conceptions. The great Teachers have to deal with the mind of the race as they find it—and that mind is essentially one of belief or of scepticism. Both are psychic states, not states of Knowledge. Being mortal and imperfect, the human mind presents to the imagination their opposites—the immortal and the perfect. We know there are higher and lower states of consciousness into which all fall, or to which all rise. Nirvana and the rest are but symbols for the highest, as Hell and *Avitchi* are but symbols for the worst states we can imagine. Both are based on past experiences of the Soul and form the groundwork of our imagination of the future. Notice how the terms bring up states of *feeling*—of bliss or misery—not of understanding knowledge. Perfection, whether in good or evil, is *always* relative to imperfection: they are merely a "pair of opposites," as memory and imagination are a pair of opposites. Both are exercises of one and the same Power—the power of Soul to create, to preserve, to destroy and re-create. It is the Soul which is the real, and Soul is always enjoying or suffering the fruits of the exercise of its own power. The ignorant Soul takes these fruits to be the Reality, not its own Self. This is *Maya.* Read and think over the last paragraph on page 39-40, first volume of *The Secret Doctrine.*

Question: What is to be understood from the many statements in Theosophical writings dealing with the "loss of the Soul," and the "annihilation" of the Black Magicians, or "Brothers of the Shadow?" Who or what is "lost," and how can *any* thing or being be "annihilated?"

Answer: Your two questions really answer themselves when correlated, one with the other. Intuition and reason—two words for the same thing, "direct perception"—both tell us that nothing can be lost, nothing can be annihilated in any *final* sense, any more than anything can be eternally unchanged. Our whole experience tells us that "nothing, absolutely nothing, remains unchanged, even for the billionth part of a second." We have to try, then, to *reconcile* the

various statements, as we are all ceaselessly striving to reconcile the apparently contradictory experiences of life. "Reconcile" with what? Not with each other. Good and evil cannot be reconciled; knowledge and ignorance cannot be reconciled; life and death cannot be reconciled; light and darkness in any sense cannot be reconciled. They all represent contradictions which are irreconcilable, by their very terms. Reconcile them with ourselves, reconcile ourselves with them. We all suffer the "loss" of what has passed beyond our present consciousness; we all "gain" whatever comes within the range of our consciousness—but we do not lose our Consciousness for all that, for "we" *are* Consciousness itself, whether we are *conscious* of much or little. All of us have been through *all* experiences, and the states *induced* by them, countless times—from highest to lowest. We are all "lost souls," to the degree that we neither know, remember, nor imagine beyond the range of the experiences and states into which we are now plunged. All of us are "brothers of the Shadow" to the extent that we dwell *in*, or *on*, the Dark side of Nature—to the extent that we attach Reality to any experience or state, "good" or "bad." The Black Magician is one who has become "constitutionally incapable" of any other than a *separative* conception of Self—or Self-interest, as the only good. The White Magician is his opposite. The "Brother of the Shadow" is "lost" to what the Masters have found—and so cannot, either during the remainder of this Manvantara, or during its succeeding Pralaya, enjoy the fruits of either unselfish or of selfless action. How could he? But on the commencement of another Manvantara the Life, or Monad, which *was* the "Black Magician" begins again as "matter," not as either "mind" or "spirit." Remember that Spirit, Mind, and Matter, are symbols fundamentally for the three universal states into which all Beings go and from which they emerge. Read the preceding Question and Answer; further understanding can be gained by thoughtful study of *Secret Doctrine*, Volume I, page 274, numbered paragraph (4); last paragraph, page 265 and top of 266; and the first full paragraph, top of page 570. Theosophy is pre-eminently the doctrine of Cycles: Whatever is "gained" by any Being has to be "preserved" *by him*, or it will be "lost" *to him*—until "regained."

Question: What is the difference between Spirit, Mind, Matter, and Energy, or Force, or *Fohat?*

Answer: No "difference" at all *fundamentally;* they are *distinctions* made by the perceiving Ego. Shut your eyes, and you will find that all "matter" at once becomes "force" which resists your energy or Fohat. The simple experiment will show you that force and mat-

ter are interchangeable terms for what is visible and what is invisible to sense-perception. Immerse yourself in clear water, open your eyes—and "water" will have ceased to be either as matter or force. It will have become to you simply a *means* of perception—light or darkness, as the case may be, to sense perception. In either case, if you look, with mental-perception, you will find that the hitherto objective has become subjective. You have *re-created* "matter," "force," "energy," "light and darkness" *meta*-physically in the forms and terms called ideas. *Both* now "exist" to you as a "pair of opposites," but *you* remain unchanged. Now, try to think of yourself, and you may see, with a third eye, that you will try to think of yourself in terms of matter, or energy, or ideas, that is, in terms of forms physical or energic or psychic. Well, *are* you any of them, or all of them? You will see for yourself that you are not. Where, then, is the "difference" between Mind, Matter, and Energy? Do they not all resolve themselves, so far as you are concerned, into states, and changes of state, in yourself? You *are*, but you "exist" in those states and they in you. And how about the states themselves? Has matter no existence apart from you, and the same as to energy and mind or idea? And if so, what kind of existence? Are they, *in themselves*, what they *seem* to you? The question can be grasped by reversing it: what do *we* seem to *them?* Animals seem thus and so to us, as we seem thus and so to them, and to ourselves. *Are* we and they what they and we *seem* to be—or have they as well as we a *real Being* beyond all states and appearances? We know there is nothing we contact which does not affect us. Must it not be that we also affect whatever we contact, name it as *we* will? What is or can this real being be but the presence of something common in the midst of all differences, creating them, sustaining them, destroying and re-creating other differences or distinctions. This "something in common" is Spirit, is the Self, is the Real. "The wisdom which perceives in all nature one single principle, indivisible and incorruptible, not separate in the separate objects seen, is of the quality of Truth."

ON THE LOOKOUT

Ecclesiastic Eccentricities

Bishop Francis John McConnell was elected President of the Federal Council of Churches in December, 1928. The election was promptly received by a prominent Presbyterian minister, Dr. Donald M. Grant, with the following remarks:

> The hearts of real Presbyterians had rather grown accustomed to be saddened by the utterances of Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, who until recently was President of the Federal Council of Churches. It was hoped that his successor would be a man whose utterances would at least be in harmony with the teachings of evangelical Christianity.
>
> But these hopes were dashed when it was learned that Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodist Church had been chosen (unanimously) as President of the Council for the next four years, as this action seems to make certain that the matter, instead of going from bad to better is going from bad to worse—if that be possible. (*Time*, February 25, 1929).

The occasion of the remark was that Bishop McConnell is a man of liberal tendencies. His leadership arose largely from his efforts to rectify labor conditions in Pittsburgh mills and mines. He has even gone so far as to say: "Is not this tendency to deify Jesus more heathen than Christian?" Which it probably would be—if anyone were able to give a sensible definition of the word "heathen" in such a connection.

The Modernist's "Soul"

A prominent modernistic minister, John Haynes Holmes, gives this definition of "soul." (*New York Times*, December 10, 1928).

> The human soul, conceived as something that is poured into a mortal body at birth and leaves it at death, is only a myth, John Haynes Holmes declared yesterday morning in his sermon at the Community Church, Park Avenue and Thirty-fourth Street.
>
> If we mean, has man a soul as the body has a heart, or a stomach, or a brain, then I say, yes, the soul is a myth; but if we mean, is man a soul, as fire is flame, or as mind is thought, then soul is not a myth.
>
> The trouble is not with our idea of soul but with our idea of man's nature. Man is essentially a unity. Body and soul are surely artificial distinctions. In every stage of evolution there appear new qualities of character and life which have never existed before. The new quality and character of man is his

> spiritual nature, not apart from him, but his own essence of being. I am myself an ego, a personality, a living entity, a soul. This great word is what we use to describe man's unity.

This is a typical "definition" of the modernistic attitude on the matter, which is a queer semi-scientific, semi-mystic and nebulous complex of predigested and undigested ideas drawn from various sources according to the taste of the individual. Dr. Holmes' words make no sense to us and we doubt whether they do to him either, but at least they are an advance upon the cast iron dogma of the older church.

Better Vision Among Clergy

A healthy and encouraging example of better vision among the clergy appears in the words of the Reverend Charles Fiske, Bishop of Central New York, who at the fifteenth annual synod of his province delivered:

> . . . a bitter arraignment of modern American civilization "which conceived God as a magnified Rotarian and practices sanctified commercialism as Christianity."
>
> At the same session Chaplain Kinsolving stated that there was an alarming decrease in religion among college students and that:
>
> Students are bristling with prejudices against religion and ministers. We must send our ablest leaders of the church, men with great intellectual ability and unusual sympathy, to bring them back within the fold of religion.

No amount of intellectual ability or "unusual" sympathy will maintain a brazen idol in midair after its clay feet are smashed entirely from under it. What Chaplain Kinsolving sees without realizing it, is the inevitable effect of gravitation upon an unsupported fetish.

Religious Tolerance

A copy of the *Hawaii Hochi* of July 11, 1929, contains an instance of religious bigotry reprehensible enough, but which appears to have produced an entirely healthy reaction. It drew a long editorial in the *Hochi*. Says the Editor:

> "I hate Buddhists!" Bishop Stephen Alencastre declared, standing in the lobby of the Young Hotel. His face was contorted with rage and he almost spat out the words. Dean Ault, whose training and previous culture should have taught him better, took his stand upon this same ground and added his voice to that of his Catholic confrere.
>
> There is nothing that a true gentleman detests as much as

a public scene in which anger is displayed. The others present were gentlemen, and were deeply humiliated at the unseemly exhibition of childish rage.

There was no racial animosity back of this outburst, for Rev. Ernest Hunt, the Buddhist priest who was insulted, is an Englishman by birth, and formerly a member of the Anglican or Episcopal church. Dean Ault called him an "apostate," which means a man who has changed his religious beliefs. This in itself shows that the hatred was of religious origin. Interpreted, it means that men like Bishop Alencastre and Dean Ault do not recognize a man's right to freedom of religion. They are still animated by the same spirit of hatred and intolerance that was the moving force behind the Spanish Inquisition. They fail to realize that the United States is a nation which was founded upon the theory of absolute freedom of religion. It was to avoid just such hatred and persecution that the early American colonists fled from Europe when that continent was seething with bitter religious wars. One can well imagine these two men, with swords in their hands, prowling about on St. Bartholomew's Eve seeking for victims to appease their hate . . .

As to the respective merits of Christianity and Buddhism we have nothing to say. Whatever religion is worthy of respect should enjoy complete freedom in a community like ours. In respect to displays of hatred like that in which the two clerical leaders indulged, we believe both Christianity and Buddhism are alike in their condemnation. Jesus was emphatic in his denunciation of hatred, while Buddha said, "Hatred is not overcome by hatred; hatred is overcome by love."

There are in Hawaii 134,000 members of the Buddhist organization to which Rev. Ernest Hunt belongs, and 83,000 of them are American citizens. They have just as much right under the constitution of the United States to enjoy freedom of belief and worship as have the members of the Catholic and Episcopal churches. And they have the right to demand that their religion be respected and that their priests be free from the humiliation of unmerited and gratuitous insult at the hands of religious fanatics!

If Bishop Alencastre and Dean Ault expect to regain the respect of the members of this community they will apologize for their ungentlemanly behavior.

FROM RELIGION TO MATERIALISM

In March, 1929, Mr. J. B. Beresford was running a series of articles on his search for a new religion. (*The Daily Express*, London). It presents a curious study and one interesting because typical of a certain type of mind—illustrative of its Karma. He was originally a Church of England man who suddenly woke up to the fact that he

had been mechanically accepting the dogmas of his church, and thereupon set forth in search. His first investigation was of Theosophy. The curious materialist-ascetic bias which explains his subsequent religious career is well enough illustrated by the fact that he at once began to practice vegetarianism and a general physical ascetism, which he regarded as "becoming more religious in his daily life." As to Theosophy, he remarks:

> But Theosophy, although I returned to a further investigation of it twenty years later, failed to hold me. The Theosophists, also, have their dogmas—such as their hard and fast assumptions with regard to Reincarnation and Karma—and, thinking my way steadily towards the all-embracing problem, I came to the conclusion that they knew too much.
>
> It seemed to me that if their beliefs as to the future life were absolutely true, I should recognize them intuitively. I did not.

This did not, however, prevent him—intuitively or otherwise—from "leaning towards materialism for many years." It seems not to have occurred to him that the "assumptions" of Theosophy were not as much "dogmas" as the dogmas of the thorough-going materialists whom he afterward followed.

From Materialism to Spiritualism

His curious return to metaphysics is expressed thus:

> I came back to a renewed question of my own doubts through F. W. H. Myers' book, "Human Personality." I have a rational, logical mind, and Myer's arguments for the existence of what he called the "subliminal" self took hold of me.

The odd thing is that Myers was one of the committee of the S. P. R., which published Hodgson's infamous "Report" on Madame Blavatsky, and who added injury to insult by incorporating her basic doctrines as to the human self in this same "Human Personality." It is this second-hand Theosophy which "took hold" of Mr. Beresford. It therefore was not the "rational" or "logical capacity" of his mind which led him to embrace these doctrines, but his Karmic affinities with the mind of Myers. As to spiritualism, he says:

> *I am quite convinced, to begin with, that many spiritualistic phenomena are due to spirit agency. But I believe further, that these spirits are, without exception, at a very low stage of spiritual evolution. After death, and more noticeably after a sudden death, the consciousness, and with it personal character, persists, at least for a time. And this surviving consciousness creates for itself a world of illusion.*

> It is much the same condition as the consciousness of a still living man might be if he were completely deprived of all his physical senses—sight, hearing, smell, taste, and all the sensations that are associated with the idea of touch.
>
> Such recently discarnate spirits as these know nothing new of the secrets of being, nor of any enduring realities outside physical life. Their accounts of spirit life vary one from another simply because they are creating their impressions out of their own imagination and expectations.

FROM SPIRITUALISM TO "MYSTICISM"

It is unnecessary to say that word for word—barring some differences as to the meaning of "spirit"—this is the Theosophical doctrine of which he is now "quite convinced," but rejected originally, apparently uninvestigated, because it was part of the "too much" which he thought Theosophists knew. His further steps along the occult line were through A. R. Orage's "New Age," through Ouspensky and Katherine Mansfield; the ideas of every one of whom in so far as they are correct—and his impressions seem mainly correct as to doctrine—were "lifted" out of Theosophical books.

He goes so far as this:

> This may appear at first sight a startling and improbable achievement, but it is not new. Many mystics—of all creeds—have done this thing, and some have attempted to record their spiritual experience, while there is first rate authority for its performance by Eastern "adepts."

Mr. Beresford is a perfect *clinical* case recognizable upon sight by all experienced Theosophists; who may even perhaps recognize in him their own former selves, even of this incarnation.

OUR GODS AND OTHER GODS

Mrs. Ray Strachey has published in London a book under the title of "Religious Fanaticism," containing a long resume of various fanatical and unbalanced religious sects. Speaking of the founders of religious sects, the reviewer says:

> They were all mystics; all believed that divine guidance comes to the individual through emotion and not reason; most taught that the "Baptism of the Holy Spirit" is manifested by physical thrill. It is only a short step from that position to the belief that all physical thrill is divine, and the next step is painfully obvious. (*Manchester Guardian Weekly,* Dec. 14, 1928).

Those who are acquainted with the physical and psychic aftermath of emotional "revivals" of the Billy Sunday type, know all too well

the bitter truth of these words. H.P.B remarked that every religious sect originated in the "personal psychological experience" of some enthusiastic or fanatic. The reviewer remarks that:

> Common sense is the test of mystical revelation. Banish it, and mysticism at once becomes its own perversion. It did so again and again in the Middle Ages, and it did so in nineteenth century America.

It would perhaps be too much to expect that the reviewer should continue indefinitely to apply his own principle, and thus one is not too disappointed by his own negation thereof in the following words:

> In the Middle Ages the check of "common sense" was applied by the real authority of the Church, and Mrs. Strachey has, without stating it, made out a tremendous case for an equally rigid religious authority in matters of doctrine and morals in the modern world.

In the Colleges

Recognizing the serious results of the lack of all moral education in our collegiate institutions, Dean Shailer Mathews, of the University of Chicago, advocates the establishment of non-sectarian religious centres as an integral part of the college, and the setting up of classes in religious history and religious psychology for undergraduates. Now if this is to include an impartial comparative study of all religions and the *true* teachings of religious history, it would be strictly in line with the Second Object of the Theosophical Movement. And it would moreover have the best of effects, for the reason that comparative religion, honestly taught, very promptly leads the college student to a perception of the actual scientific basis and the real, not fictitious, moral values of the great basic philosophies, such as taught by Buddha, Krishna, Confucius, and Lao-Tze.

Dr. Mathews makes a remark very interesting to Theosophists who know, or should know, the deadly effects of the crooked and dishonest thinking which prevails in science as well as religion. He says:

> One sometimes thinks that the American undergraduate is the greatest rationalizer in the world. It is my experience that the habit of honest thinking among college men is in inverse ratio to keeness of intellect, certainly to sophistication. The student is continually played upon by two sets of influences which make honest thinking difficult. The one is the accepted unrealities of his social life; the other is the pseudo-realism of the current intellectual mode.
>
> Our study of science does not necessarily produce honest thinking. It is easy to be thoroughly impartial about objective

facts, and yet to be tragically self-deceived in these intimate and subjective matters which bear on our abilities, our desires, our fears, our place in the world. If there is any great need in American education, it is training for leadership in progress, training which will raise up a generation of men and women with a quiet passion for the truth about living. (H. P. Van Duzen, Executive Secretary, National Y.M.C.A. *New York Times,* July 20, 1928).

A Chinese Definition of Superstition

An editorial in the *Miami Herald,* Jan. 14, 1929, is indicator of the great distance which thought in this country has come since the Theosophical Movement was inaugurated. Says the *Herald:*

> There is a possibility that the action of the government of Canton in South China in forbidding the showing of an American film of "Ben Hur" will have a good effect in this country in calling the attention of many persons to the fact that other countries have different religious beliefs.
>
> "Ben Hur" has been forbidden on the ground that it is "Christian propaganda decoying the people to superstition which must not be tolerated in the present age of enlightenment." Of course, the believers in the religion of Confucius have a right to regard the religious ideas of other nations as myths just as Christians in this country refer to Chinese beliefs as "superstition."

The Editor is equally correct in saying:

> But the Chinese will hardly accomplish anything by suppressing "Ben Hur" or any other moving picture that might set forth the merits of any religion. The only difference between education and propaganda is that one deals with what you believe while the other doesn't. All depends on the point of view. If any religion can be shattered by a moving picture then it is hardly worth bothering about.

"The Teacher's Task"

Writing under this caption, Glenn Frank, President of the University of Wisconsin, expresses himself thus:

> "Rabbi," said Nicodemus to Jesus, when he paid his now famous night visit to the Galilean prophet, "we know that thou art a teacher come from God."
>
> As the president of a university in which approximately 1000 men and women bear the name of teacher, I am interested in this reference to Jesus as a teacher.
>
> If Jesus was a teacher extraordinary, as has been said so many times, what were the essentials of his teaching genius?
>
> I look in vain through the New Testament for any tables of statistics he presented to his hearers.

I find no labored analyses of masses of historical data.

I find no record of assigned reading that he asked his hearers to ponder.

I find no sets of examination questions submitted to his followers.

I find no record of any commencement exercises in which he gave diplomas or degrees to his disciples.

In short, here was a great teacher who got along without any of the elaborate paraphernalia we now associate with the task of teaching.

I suspect he got along without the elaborate instruments of modern teaching because the intention of his teaching was different from the intention of much that now goes by the name of teaching.

He was not interested in giving his hearers new information.

He was interested in giving them a new way of looking at all information, old and new.

He was not interested in having his hearers absorb a mass of standardized information, but in having them think about the pressing problems of their own lives.

He was not interested in increasing their knowledge.

He was interested in increasing their understanding.

He was not concerned to have them practice remembering.

He wanted them to practice thinking.

Jesus would have a hard time getting an appointment to a $1500 instructorship in a modern university.

And yet Jesus was one of the great teachers of his day.

We must make a place for great teachers as well as for efficient instructors.

Unusual Discernment

To the above, all thinkers will say, "Amen." The University of Wisconsin is a progressive institution and its President, a man of unusual discernment. He shows with crystal clearness the enormous gap between pseudo-education and real life.

> "Can we fail to see the imperative need of a *synthetic education* which will regard all life as a unit; the nature of man as unitary; that there is no spiritual *and* moral *and* intellectual, unrelated and independent of one another; but there is One Life expressing itself through all these various faculties? In considering moral education possible by itself, we have proved our ignorance. In the last analysis religion and education have failed because they have thought man had a soul, as a thing apart, which must be saved. Man *is* a soul—the soul is the man. The soul manifests as mind, as feeling, as body, and only when we educate and use all faculties for the purposes of the immortal soul, will either the school or the world find its true place in the great evolutionary, and educational Scheme of Nature and of Man." (*Moral Education,* Page 17).

"We should aim at creating *free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects, and above all things, *unselfish.* And we believe that much if not all of this could be obtained by *proper and truly Theosophical* education."—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

DANGERS OF SPECIALISM

An article in the *Los Angeles Examiner,* is entitled "Why Experts and Specialists Are Often Dangerous Persons To Follow." The sub-heading runs:

Curious Psychological Twists of the Human Mind
Which are Likely to Warp the
Judgment and Balance When a Subject
Is Studied Long and Intensively and
Produce Misleading Advice From Those
Who Ought to Be Most Competent.

The article is replete with practical examples. Says the writer:

The expert is often wrong because "he cannot see the forest for the trees," as the popular adage puts it. His eye is too close to the detailed facts of his subject, like a bricklayer trying to get an idea of a giant skyscraper by holding his face a few feet from a small bit of the wall. A stranger often has, as people say, a "better perspective," often he can help a perplexed individual to see a way through some difficulty that seemed insoluble. That is one reason, perhaps the main reason, why "two heads are better than one."

Nowadays the scientific psychologists are coming to suspect that all such ancient facts of human common sense are merely manifestations of a deep-seated psychological law; the law that good judgments are easier to form when the facts are not too familiar or too thoroughly known. If this law is really true and can be established beyond doubt, it will have profound effects on practical affairs, as well as on the theories of how the human mind works. One of the things that it will mean is that specialists and experts may be excellent people to go to for the facts of a subject, but people whose opinions and advice the careful man will do well to avoid.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN CALIFORNIA

For quite a long time during the past, there has been a series of consistent endeavors to abolish capital punishment in California. Its survival is an anachronism in the existence of a State legal system which otherwise is second to but few in the United States.

An editorial in the *Los Angeles Times* epitomizes the thread-bare arguments for capital punishment and at the same time demonstrates the methods used by the advocates of social savagery—namely, the

application of derogatory epithets, the advancing of facts which have no necessary logical bearing upon the case at issue, and the blind ignoring of any and all facts which may be found inconvenient. Says the editorial:

> In view of the sickeningly atrocious slayings of innocent children, as well as others, in California, in recent years, and the generally recognized necessity for tightening up all the laws for the punishment of violent crime, one wonders that legislation should be proposed or even dreamed of at Sacramento or elsewhere for the repeal of capital punishment. Yet several bills designed to effect such repeal are now on file in the State Senate and Assembly.

The Times advances as arguments for capital punishment the fact of a recent agitation in Michigan to return to capital punishment, and an increase of crimes of violence in Austria since capital punishment was abolished. No mention is made of the fact that cold, hard statistics from all over the world show that the vast majority of countries which have no capital punishment, likewise have far less murder than others.

Dog Fashions in Dress

A New York dispatch of July 15, 1929:

> The fall fashions for dogs came out today, and some of them are enough to make Strongheart turn in his grave.
>
> Jewels, swanky coats with rhinestone monograms, special boudoir accessories and anklets fringed with white monkey fur, are among the numerous vanities which the well-dressed dog will sport next season, and the enthusiasm with which they were greeted on Park Avenue heralded the beginning of a new social order, in which clothes as well as pedigree, make the dog.
>
> Many of the fashions are for distinctive breeds. Collars, as an example, must be plaid designs on Scotch terriers; in leather with oval brass studs for Boston bulls; braided leather for police dogs and tiny round morocco bands for Pekes, Poms and Maltese. Certain colors are suitable for some dogs and not for others. Many of the collars are studded with rare gems.

There is a strange degeneracy visible in the relations between civilized men and animals. On the one hand we have the cold heartlessness of many forms of vivisection; on the other the lavish love of pets, especially dogs. The average dog lover seems to have no hesitation in maintaining in a thickly crowded neighborhood a barking nuisance. No doubt, in times and places where animals and men maintain a mutually helpful relation in practical affairs, the association is beneficial. But the distorted specimens of animal nature we maintain among us for giving an outlet to emotion form a different

category altogether. They are an offshoot of the ramifying tentacle of the ancient "sin of the mindless men," an unnatural recrudescenc of forgotten "commingling with the elementals."

A PROTESTANT CONFESSIONAL

The Reverend M. R. Lovell, of the Mount Pleasant Congrega tional Church of Washington, has established a Life Adjustmen Institute which is nothing more or less than the Catholic confessiona plus Freudist and behavioristic trimmings. *(Washington Post,* Ma 19, 1929).

> All manner of "complexes" were treated in the best manner known to modern psychology. By sympathetic listening and questioning, the irrationality of various fears was pointed out, treatments suggested for the conquering of all manner of problems . . .
>
> Mr. Lovell declares that unless the Mosaic code coincides with the latest discoveries in science, the advice of the staff ran counter to the injunctions of the Pentateuch. (sic) . . .
>
> Scores of persons, who were trying to work out some religious philosophy that would not do violence to what they regarded as the demonstrated truths of science, were benefited by discussions at the sessions of the institute, the pastor declares.

"JEHOVAH COMPLEX"

The Catholic confessional provides an almost unbreakable bon between the church and its member, due partly to the deep seate intimacy thereby generated, partly to the gratitude of the membe for having his mental burdens lightened, and partly to facilitate th probing into the individual soul, which, with its ramifications of influ ence and suggestion, ultimately enables the ecclesiastic to make o the member's mind in every spiritual respect a subsidiary of th church mind. It proceeds largely from a "Jehovah complex" owne by most of us in some degree, the most prominent manifestation o which is the passion, active or latent in the human breast, to giv advice. Among Theosophists of varying degrees it is manifested i the longing to pose as "*guru*" to one's fellows.